

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*August 7, 2014
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	1
RCRA Class III Modifications.....	2
Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment.....	4
Update on Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review Notice	7
618-10 Vertical Pipe Unit (VPU) Methods Testing Results	10
100 F/IU Area Proposed Plan	12
Committee Business.....	12
Attachments	13
Attendees	14

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>

Opening

Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee adopted the June 2014 meeting summary.

RCRA Class III Modifications**

*Agency Presentation**

Ron Skinnarland, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided the committee with an update on the status and impacts of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Class III Modifications that Ecology is currently in the process of drafting. Ron noted the following points in his presentation:

- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is currently working to submit permit modifications for inactive units in the Solid Waste Operations Complex (SWOC). The next step will be for Ecology to bring the rest of the SWOC units (which include the Central Waste Complex [CWC] and Waste Receiving and Processing Facility, T-Plant, and Low-Level Burial Grounds) into Hanford's current permit.
- The EPA Consent Agreement and Final Order (CAFO) calls for a total of fourteen units to be closed. Of these, the only two areas that currently store waste are Outdoor Storage Area A and Outdoor Storage Area B at the CWC.
- The schedule for the closure of Outside Storage Area A and Outdoor Storage Area B extends to 2030, and the effort will involve shipping waste to PermaFix Northwest or EnergySolutions for treatment. Inspections and oversight are ongoing in light of the proposed extended closure timeframe.
- Official records show that there have been no contamination events at any units included in the CAFO. However, even if records demonstrate that an area is clean, samples need to be taken to ensure that this is accurate. If any contamination is found, the area needs to be treated before its storage permit can be closed.
- Under the EPA CAFO, two units from T-Plant will undergo closure efforts. These units (211-T Pad and 211-T Sand Filter Pad) are inactive, and closure will require extensive sampling by U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to ensure that no contamination from past storage efforts persists. In addition, DOE proposed two other inactive T-Plant units (211-T Railroad Cut and 277-T Building) for closure.
- Ecology is taking a very critical look at DOE's proposed 2030 closure schedule; the process is ongoing and lengthy. Ecology is currently working to issue a draft permit to close units, which is expected to open for public comment in approximately five months. The comment period schedule has not yet been determined, but it will last for a minimum of 45 days. Ecology expects to bring all of the SWOC into the current permit in approximately one year.

* Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

* Attachment 2: Draft HAB Advice: Class III Modifications to the Hanford Site RCRA Permit

* Attachment 3: Permit Class III Modification Update Presentation (Ecology)

- The public and the Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) will have chance to comment on the modifications; Ecology is currently working to address several of the HAB's previously stated concerns while drafting the permit modifications.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. Have any contaminants been discovered around Box 231-ZDR 11?

R. Washington Department of Health tested soil and air samples from the area around 231-ZDR-11, but analysis of results did not return any results of great concern. The concentrations of most contaminants did not exceed standards set for drinking water. There was no measured radiological contamination.

Q. What can be found inside of the storage containers at Outdoor Storage Area A and Outdoor Storage Area B?

R. [Ecology] In approximately half of the storage containers, there will likely be plutonium wastes that will need to be shipped to New Mexico's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant or treated at the Hanford Site before they can be disposed of. Several containers are believed to contain some liquids.

Q. Could DOE save time and money if they removed some of these storage sites from the permit?

R. [Ecology] There is an administrative burden to keeping these areas open and on-permit, and continued sampling adds to this cost. Areas where drums are currently stored will likely remain on the permit for at least ten more years. If areas that currently contain no dangerous waste can be proven clean, they may be removed from the permit.

Q. Should the Board work to release advice as soon as possible, or would it be more appropriate to release advice during the upcoming public comment period?

R. [Ecology] Ecology is interested in hearing the HAB's thoughts on this matter, and the Board is free to provide advice whenever it is able.

R. [DOE-RL] DOE would like to get our application to Ecology before the end of the year. It is likely that the 60-day comment period for the permit modifications will occur in March.

C. The topic of RCRA Class III Modifications was first visited by RAP in June 2013. It was noted as an issue that the HAB should weigh in on, but it has been pushed off due to scheduling difficulties. It is frustrating that the Board has not been able to weigh in on this matter yet. The Board could release advice during the March 2015 public comment period, but it will have lost the opportunity to weigh in on the modifications as they are being written.

R. A 60-day period for the Board to create and adopt advice is very rushed. The HAB should not limit itself by conforming to public comment schedules. The Board should release advice when there is a need, not only when the HAB's schedule matches up with comment periods.

C. This subject and the draft advice are both very complex. There are many issues at play, and RAP should not move this draft advice forward until we have a better grasp on the topic and a clearer idea of what we would like to accomplish.

R. It should not be assumed that the Board will comment on every Class II or Class III Modification. In the case of the RCRA modification, RAP should wait and retool this advice once we see the next document released by Ecology.

Q. There are going to be more Class III Modifications coming out in the future. The Board needs to be aware of future comment periods, and it should strive to release advice on future modifications as early in the process as possible. Could agencies modify the release date for future Class II and III Modifications to allow for committee presentations (and the potential release of advice) to occur before the public comment period? This would be very helpful to the Board.

R. [DOE-RL] Perhaps RAP could have a standing meeting topic that identifies upcoming permit modifications. This would give the committee the opportunity to discuss upcoming modifications early in the process, and it would give RAP members the opportunity to decide whether or not an issue is important for the Board to weigh in on.

Pam thanked Ecology for the update. The committee recommended that Mike Collins, U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations (DOE-RL), provide Kris Skopek, DOE-RL, with a list of upcoming modifications. Kris could then work with the facilitation team to schedule briefings during future RAP meetings. After hearing updates on proposed modifications, RAP could decide whether or not to provide advice. The committee felt that it was important for the Board to have the opportunity to comment on future modifications, and they requested that future reports and briefings on these topics be created with clarity and readability in mind.

Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility Record of Decision (ROD) Amendment**

Agency Presentation

Emy Laija, EPA, introduced the topic of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) Record of Decision (ROD) amendment by describing the background issues that precipitated the creation of draft advice. Emy stated that there have been ongoing meetings between the local EPA office and EPA headquarters pertaining to the ROD amendment. The local EPA office requested that the HAB produce clear advice weighing in on the issue following an EPA presentation at the February RAP meeting. The ROD amendment would allow for the treatment of a limited amount of large hazardous waste by a

* Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

* Attachment 4: Draft HAB Advice: ERDF ROD Amendment

macroencapsulation treatment process in-trench (at ERDF), as opposed to first being transferred to a staging area outside of the trench. Emy stated that the proposed in-trench practice is safer for workers and the local environment than the out-of-trench process required by current Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs).

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. In what ways is in-trench macroencapsulation better than out-of-trench macroencapsulation?

R. [EPA] Worker safety is improved, the risk of contamination is lessened, and the process is more cost-efficient.

Q. What is the difference between in-trench and out-of-trench macroencapsulation?

R. [EPA] The product itself is not changed; in-trench macroencapsulation is simply a safer process that involves less risk. The waiver to allow in-trench macroencapsulation at the Hanford Site would permit the macroencapsulation treatment for large, hazardous waste to occur within the ERDF trench area, which would simplify the process and limit the potential for worker exposure and environmental contamination.

Q. Is it possible for EPA headquarters to address these regulations at a higher level, as opposed to pursuing a waiver?

R. [EPA] In the short-term, this is not possible.

Q. As written, this draft advice is problematic. The Board would be supporting changing the LDRs without going through the waiver process, and this could set a dangerous precedent.

R. [EPA] EPA views this waiver as specific to the Hanford Site and this advice as specific to a single location within the Hanford Site.

C. The reason that the waiver is necessary is because liquids should not be disposed of in landfills. This advice is not specific enough to release; it needs to incorporate language that explicitly describes what waste it references. There is currently not enough information incorporated into the advice that defines and limits what can go into the trench. Executing macroencapsulation in-trench is not a bad idea; however, this advice should very clearly define what types of materials a waiver should cover.

R. [EPA] In this advice, the Board would not be approving what wastes are allowed to go into the trenches, and, at this stage, including highly technical language in the advice would likely not be beneficial to the agencies. The wastes that can go into landfills are already clearly defined with EPA headquarters, and that wording is probably not necessary for purposes of this advice. Containerized waste and liquids would not be included in the waiver.

C. There is a history of agencies taking HAB advice and transferring it in ways that the Board did not originally intend. Advice on this topic needs to explicitly note that the waiver should only apply to waste with no potential for liquids. The word “debris” is not enough on its own.

R. [EPA] EPA would like to explore a waiver. The concerns that the committee is raising are valid, but they would be more appropriate to discuss during the public comment process for the waiver itself.

Q. Why would this advice need to be highly prescriptive on size reduction? This is an engineering issue, not one for the HAB.

R. If the background for the advice notes “large, heavy hazardous waste,” could the advice itself refer back to this language? The advice and its background should reflect one another, and there should not be a problem with future adaptation so long as the specific instance that the EPA is discussing is noted and recognized.

R. If the advice is too specific and excludes something important, that may be worse than arguing what qualifies as “appropriate” at a later date. Incorporating overly cumbersome language into this advice would be unfortunate and counterproductive to its intent.

Q. What specific materials qualify as “large, heavy hazardous waste debris?”

*R. [EPA] This level of detail was given to the RAP committee in February 2014. A copy of the presentation can be distributed to interested parties.**

Q. Is there a downside to including more specific language in this advice pertaining to acceptable types of waste?

R. [EPA] EPA would like this advice to support the waiver process. If the focus and concern of the advice is largely directed towards how the advice itself may be adapted to future decisions, the most important aspect of this advice—supporting workers and reducing risk—may be lost in the overall message.

Q. Should the RAP Committee plan on conducting an additional round of edits on the language of this draft advice via email?

R. If the committee is very concerned about the language of the advice and feels strongly about the issues that are being raised, the advice should not be brought before the Board. Updating advice through email is very difficult to effectively execute.

R. [EPA] If this advice is not brought to the September Board Meeting, it is probably not necessary to continue with it. EPA would like this as soon as possible, so that we can present EPA headquarters with stakeholder input. We would like to begin this process by the end of the year at the latest.

* Attachment 5: ERDF Macroencapsulation Presentation (originally presented February 2014)

Q. Does this have to be advice? Could we release this as a letter instead?

R. [EPA] Advice that has consensus would carry more weight than a letter.

Q. Would it be possible for RAP to see a copy of EPA's waiver as this draft advice is reviewed and finalized?

R. [EPA] This is likely not possible until the waiver is finalized. At the moment, EPA is not asking the Board to weigh in on the waiver itself, just the process.

The committee concluded discussion by requesting that EPA look into the possibility of sharing the draft waiver. Members agreed that they would look into this document, if possible, and the Board requested an EPA representative at the September Board meeting to respond to questions. EPA noted that the advice's purpose was moving in a direction that they did not anticipate, and they reiterated that it would be most beneficial for the HAB to weigh in on the process of in-trench macroencapsulation as opposed to the EPA waiver itself.

Update on Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review Notice*

Agency Presentation

Joe Voice, DOE-RL, provided an update on the upcoming Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review process. He began by noting that extensive information on the process can be found at www.epa.gov/superfund/fiveyearreview. Joe stated that the site compiles materials that address the process from both the governmental and the non-governmental perspective.

Joe noted that the next CERCLA Five-Year Review at the Hanford Site (for release in 2016) is currently entering the preliminary planning phase. He recognized that the reviews take a long time to compile and that there are few dedicated resources that can be devoted to the effort. Past reviews have taken upwards of eighteen months to complete. Current review tasks include scoping resources and identifying funding for the process in the upcoming fiscal year. The documents to be associated with and incorporated into the review have yet to be identified; this activity will likely begin in late fall or early winter 2014.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

* Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

Q. RAP's first experience with the CERCLA Five-Year Review was in the 300-Area. Does the CERCLA review only cover areas where cleanup has been completed?

R. [DOE-RL] Inclusion in the CERCLA review extends beyond completed remediation. An area where remediation is still in progress may also be incorporated.

Q. Outcomes of the five-year review have been criticized in the past. Will the upcoming CERCLA review recognize the accuracy of projected remediation outcomes? Will objective data be used to validate these projections?

R. [DOE-RL] The review will be looking at the data that are available. At this early point in the process, there is no Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP) to share. However, DOE will note the committee's concerns. There is a difference between the CERCLA Five-Year Review and a SAP. On its own, the CERCLA review does not guide what goes into the SAP.

Q. If a SAP is not driven by the five-year review, but the five-year review depends on the SAP, what determines the success and the adequacy of the five-year review?

R. [EPA] The five-year review is based on sampling documents, which drive sampling efforts and long-term maintenance plans. The SAP is constructed within that primary function. The five-year review then takes the information that is pulled from that process. If anyone is interested in knowing which areas will be included in the next five-year review, look at what has been incorporated in the past and then add in any decision documents released after the previous review.

Q. Are SAPs an integral part of the five-year review?

R. [DOE-RL] No, they are not.

Q. Will the five-year review summarize data from the span that it covers? Using groundwater reports as an example, could the review incorporate a summary of the five, one-year groundwater reports released during the dates that the report spans? This would help to illustrate trends in monitoring data.

R. [DOE-RL] We will take that into consideration as we move forward with planning.

C. It may be important to re-read the advice that the HAB released following the last CERCLA review. The Board needs to be sure that the process supports effective and sound remediation efforts.

Q. Last time RAP was briefed on the review, our trust was shaken. The committee would like to ensure that remedies are working. Does the Board have the opportunity to weigh in on the process as it is occurring, or are you following a strongly-defined procedure?

R. [DOE-RL] At the moment, the review process intends to follow the EPA and the DOE process documents. The review is required to look at institutional controls as they are defined in the ROD.

R. As this process moves forward, RAP needs to look into RODs and ensure they are funded.

Q. At this stage in the process, is there anything that the Board can do to support the upcoming CERCLA review efforts? When can RAP expect an update on planning and schedule?

R. [DOE-RL] It is too early in the process for DOE to anticipate how the HAB may be of assistance. DOE will return to RAP if any opportunities arise and as more information becomes available.

Q. Can the Board give early guidance as to the parts of the Hanford Site that are going to be included in the review?

R. [DOE-RL] We will take that into consideration as we move forward with planning.

Q. Is there a way that the Board can review Work Plans for remedies that have an accompanying SAP?

R. [DOE-RL] The remedies for the Work Plans that are in place are already finalized.

Q. Do we have the opportunity to comment on the SAP? A persistent concern of the Board is that sampling at the Hanford Site has not been as comprehensive as it should be.

R. [EPA] There is no comment period built into many of the more technical plans and documents at the Hanford Site, and it is often difficult for agencies to accept public comments outside of an officially sanctioned period.

Q. If a remedy were to fail, would that trigger a public comment period?

R. [DOE-RL] If a remedy is not performing as anticipated, DOE would look for corrective actions. The type of corrective action identified would determine the subsequent adoption processes.

Q. Will the review be taking predictions and comparing them to data that have been collected? For example, if there was a groundwater plume and a treatment strategy was expected to reduce contamination by thirty percent, but sampling data found that the plume was only reduced by fifteen percent, what would happen?

R. [EPA] If a remedy is not performing as expected, corrective action would not wait for the five-year review. When agencies look at sampling results, they constantly consider how remedies are working and how they could work better. All that the CERCLA Five-Year Review states is that—at the time of the review's release—a remedy is functioning as expected.

R. There is the real-world example of the uranium plume in the 300 Area. The five-year review demonstrated that the remedy was not working, so DOE revisited the effort.

The committee closed discussion on the topic by requesting that DOE follow up with RAP leadership whenever there is a stronger sense of timing and activity. RAP felt that it was important for the Board to have the opportunity to weigh in on the process early. RAP also requested that DOE provide the committee with a list of operating units to be included in the 2016 CERCLA review.

618-10 Vertical Pipe Unit (VPU) Methods Testing Results*

*Agency Presentation**

Cathy Louis, DOE-RL, and Mark Buckmaster, DOE-RL, presented a briefing on the approach, method testing, and path forward for the 618-10 Vertical Pipe Unit (VPU) remediation plan. Their briefing noted the following main points:

- Initial work will occur at the 618-10 Burial Ground, where 94 VPUs are located.
- The steps for the VPU Baseline Remediation Approach are as follows:
 1. Install an over-casing around the VPU using a vibratory hammer.
 2. Use a large-scale auger tool to bore down inside of the over-casing. The auger tool is enclosed, and any reactions that may occur during the process will do so underground.
 3. If the VPU is suspected to contain transuranic waste, the augered material would be removed drum-by-drum. DOE is currently developing tools to characterize waste on-site.
- DOE has been using field mockups for VPU remediation method testing; results have been positive. The next step in the method testing process is an operational test for the auger enclosure.
- Geologic conditions at 618-10 differ from method testing area (618-10 is largely a sandy substrate, as opposed to Hanford gravels). This will result in increased compaction and limited void space and may make it more difficult to place over-casings and to auger. Ongoing planning efforts are taking this difference into account.
- Next steps in the process involve collaborating with vendors to optimize equipment, training on-site personnel, performing additional equipment tests and mockups. Equipment will likely be gathered in fall 2014, and training will occur in the months following. DOE plans on beginning this remediation in FY2015.
- Potholing to determine VPU type will likely commence in September 2014.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. How does DOE plan on drying the materials before they are sent to ERDF?

* Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

* Attachment 6: 618-10 Vertical Pipe Unit Remediation Presentation (DOE)

R. [DOE-RL] DOE anticipates an insignificant amount of liquids in the VPUs. Small amounts of water may be used in the process, but only to suppress dust.

Q. Some of the VPUs are recognized to have elbows in them. Is there any potential for criticality?

R. [DOE-RL] The material is expected to be very low-activity as it retrieved. The process of augering and mixing dilutes the VPU contents.

C. The blending and mixing of materials is troubling. Diluting hazardous materials with surrounding substrate may be viewed as cost effective; however, it produces additional amounts of waste that requires disposal.

R. [DOE-RL] When the casings are driven down over the VPU, they need to be large enough that they do not hit the sides of the unit. DOE has had to consider this process with regards to nuclear safety procedures, and we have a draft SAP. If RAP is interested in hearing more detail on either of these process points, DOE can present this information at a future meeting.

Q. Will DOE test how the HEPA filter in the portable ventilation unit will interact with moisture?

R. [DOE-RL] Yes. The HEPA filter is being looked into as a part of the remediation approach.

R. Savannah River National Laboratory is currently testing filter technology for the Vitrification Plant and other treatment facilities. Perhaps their findings could help the VPU remediation efforts.

Q. Will these remediation strategies transfer to 618-11?

R. [DOE-RL] Yes; in large part they will. 618-10 is being remediated first, because it was sequenced before 618-11. Also, 618-11 will likely be more procedurally complex, as the Nuclear Regulatory Agency will be involved in remediation efforts at the site.

Q. What are the next steps? When should RAP next check on this process?

R. [DOE-RL] Mockups and worker training should occur during the first two quarters of 2015. Work should begin in June 2015. We could come back to RAP in summer of 2015 with an update. We could also look into returning to the committee whenever the SAP is finalized.

Q. Could the HAB look into this process in action and observe a mockup or training?

R. [DOE-RL] Yes.

The committee thanked DOE-RL for the information. The committee tentatively recommended that they revisit this topic in summer of 2015 (or once the SAP is finalized). Committee members were also interested in exploring a potential site visit to observe mockups and training as they occur.

100 F/IU Area Proposed Plan*

Issue Manager Introduction

Dale Engstrom began the 100-F and Isolated Unit (100 F/IU) update by noting that the 100-F Proposed Plan (REV.0) for cleanup of contaminated sites and groundwater was out for comment until August 11, 2014. He recognized that the draft advice was the result of RAP conversations beginning in summer 2013. Dale stated that the draft advice works to comment on both the Institutional Controls incorporated into REV.0, as well as capture necessary reflections on the REV.0 process.

Regulator Perspectives

Chris Guzzetti, EPA, updated the committee on the ongoing public comment period for the Proposed Plan REV.0, stating that there had been 150 submitted comments and 100 commenters.

Committee Questions and Responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

The committee discussed the draft advice as it was composed, and offered several suggestions for adding clarity to the wording. RAP members felt that it was important to further reinforce the link between the advice and its background, and they also noted that the background should be written with the public in mind and attention to clarity.

The committee reiterated their belief that Monitored Natural Attenuation is not an acceptable method of treating 100-F.

The committee agreed to advance the advice, as edited, for further discussion and possible advancement to the September board meeting.

Committee Business

Update on Executive Issues Committee Leadership Workshop

Steve Hudson, HAB chair, briefly updated the committee on outcomes of the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) Leadership Workshop. He noted that DOE plans to keep more continuity in agency liaisons and involve more senior management in the HAB's work in the coming year.

Steve also recommended that the committee read the DOE assessment report and reflect upon how the HAB may wish to respond to some of the noted impacts. Major takeaways from the report included: streamlining processes between DOE and the HAB, ensuring that the right people are in the room during conversations, and reducing lengthy delays between meetings. Steve stated that a major topic of

* Attachment 7: Draft HAB Advice: RI/FS and Proposed Plan for the 100-FR-1, 100-FR-2, 100-FR-3, 100-IU-2, and 100-IU-6 Operable Units

discussion was the idea of sounding boards, and the importance of communication strategies not burdened in the same ways as the advice process.

Steve concluded by recognizing that the conversation is still ongoing. The EIC will continue to work with DOE in the coming months to make HAB interactions more impactful and to finalize the HAB's FY2015 Work Plan.

*Update 3-Month Work Plan***

The committee updated its 3-Month Work Plan and requested a meeting in September that will include the following topics:

- Discussions and lessons learned from the July 2014 EIC Leadership Workshop
- An update on the DOE budget as it relates to the RAP scope, including budget priorities and a summary of Hanford Site projects to be reduced
- Principles for Central Plateau Cleanup
- A tour of K-Basins and N Area

The committee agreed that they would clarify the agenda for their next meeting during their August Committee Call.

Potential topics for the October/November meetings include a discussion on the 300 Area Remediation Work Plan, an update on K-Basin sludge, and an update on Central Plateau Inner Area Principles.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

Attachment 2: Draft HAB Advice: Class III Modifications to the Hanford Site RCRA Permit

Attachment 3: Permit Class III Modification Update Presentation (Ecology)

Attachment 4: Draft HAB Advice: ERDF ROD Amendment

Attachment 5: ERDF Macroencapsulation Presentation (originally presented February 2014)

Attachment 6: 618-10 Vertical Pipe Unit Remediation Presentation (DOE)

Attachment 7: Draft HAB Advice: RI/FS and Proposed Plan for the 100-FR-1, 100-FR-2, 100-FR-3, 100-IU-2, and 100-IU-6 Operable Units

Attachment 8: RAP 3-Month Work Plan

* Attachment 1: Transcribed flipcharts

* Attachment 8: RAP 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Richard Smith
Dale Engstrom	Jonathan Matthews	Bob Suyama
Gary Garnant	Liz Mattson (phone)	Art Tackett
Barbara Harper (phone)	Maynard Plahuta	Gene Van Liew
Steve Hudson	Gerald Pollet	Jean Vanni
Pam Larsen	Dan Serres	Steve White

Others:

Michael Collins, DOE-RL	Debra Alexander, Ecology	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Al Farabee, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Rodney Skeen, CTUIR
Bryan Foley, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
Jim Hansen, DOE-RL	Elis Eberlein, Ecology	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
Cathy Louie, DOE-RL	Heather John, Ecology	Mark McKenna, MSA
Kris Skopek, DOE-RL	Steven Lowe, Ecology	Amoret Bunn, PNNL
Joe Voice, DOE-RL	Deborah Singleton, Ecology	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Rochelle Juetten, WCH
	Chris Guzzetti, EPA	Peter Bengtson, WCH
	Emy Laija, EPA	Richard Stout, WSU
	Tom Rogers, WA-DOH	